Trans-Lake Washington Project
Washington State Department of Transportation Sound Transit

April 18, 2002, Community Design Workshop – Executive Summary

A community design workshop for the Eastlake, Roanoke Park, Portage Bay, and north Capitol Hill neighborhoods was held on April 18, 2002, from 4:00 until 8:00 p.m. at the Scottish Rite Masonic Center. The purpose of the workshop was to update the community on the status of the Trans-Lake Washington Project and to solicit community feedback on the following issues:

- Mitigation opportunities
- Community connectivity
- Local access ramps and streets

Over thirty invitees attended the workshop. For a list of participants and project team in attendance, please see Appendix C. Invitees were selected based on the proximity of their business, property, or residence to the SR 520 corridor. Approximately forty-five invitations were distributed electronically or by mail. Invitees who did not respond to the invitation, we attempted to contact by phone the day prior to the workshop to remind them of the event.

After the introduction of the project team, including representatives from the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), Sound Transit (ST), City of Seattle Transportation, and consultants, participants were provided a report of the project's status and objectives for the workshop. Workshop participants then broke into smaller groups and were directed to three working stations. Each station was focused around one of the major issues and staffed by project team members. Attendees were encouraged to ask questions and give feedback on the issues by talking with staff, marking on existing interchange diagrams, and filling out comment forms.

Following the small working sessions, the group was reassembled and each station leader reported major issues raised at each table. Overall themes included:

- ✓ Participants would like to see a lid between 10th Avenue and Delmar to improve connectivity, specifically bicycle/pedestrian connections.
- ✓ Participants were interested in increased bicycle/pedestrian connections beyond what the team had proposed, such as creating an underpass under 10th to connect the Interlake/Broadway East neighborhoods.
- ✓ Participants would like to maintain the existing Roanoke off-ramp. Most requested that the project team demonstrate whether the ramp could be closed without increasing surface street congestion in both the Eastlake and Montlake neighborhoods.
- ✓ Some participants requested that the project team be prepared to discuss transportation demand management at the neighborhood level.
- ✓ Participants were interested in the existing noise sampling information and suggested several locations where more sampling should occur and locations for noise walls as mitigation measures. More detailed information on noise wall locations and height was requested.
- ✓ Some participants were supportive of the acquisition of the row of homes west of I-5 to be used as open space. However, participants did not want to see density in other areas increase as a result.

April 18, 2002, Community Design Workshop – Summary

Welcome, Introductions and Meeting Objectives

Pat Serie, EnviroIssues, introduced the project team to the community, including representatives from the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), Sound Transit (ST), and City of Seattle Transportation.

The purpose of the community design workshop was to relate the current status of the project, discuss the current and evolving design process, and to obtain input from the community regarding unresolved design issues. The format of the workshop was as follows:

- Outline of outstanding alternatives design issues; opportunity for clarifying questions
- Roundtable sessions to provide feedback on drawings, maps
- Report back from roundtable participants; remaining issues for follow-up discussion

Outline of Outstanding Alternatives Design Issues; Opportunity for Clarifying Questions

Les Rubstello, WSDOT, reminded the group that the City of Seattle Transportation, while not a project co-sponsor, represents the elected officials from Seattle sitting on the Executive Committee and is co-sponsoring the workshops along with WSDOT and Sound Transit so they hear firsthand the community's concerns about the project.

The project team members present at the workshop are those responsible for designing the interchanges for each of the project's alternatives. Input from workshop participants on the six and eight lane alternatives and the design issues associated with each is specifically being sought.

The current funding for the project will be spent between now and December 2002. Both the statewide vote on a tax increase in November 2002, and a regional vote within the next year, will determine future project funding. The limited funding available between now and the end of the year may prevent the project team from beginning to write the draft environmental impact statement (EIS) until 2003.

Les outlined the outstanding design issues and briefly described the opportunities for community input.

1. Function of access ramps. The ramps under discussion are Roanoke, Boylston, Harvard, and Lakeview. There is a flyover ramp up against Boylston, relatively close to homes. Noise walls would be added to mitigate the impact of the flyover ramp. These noise walls may create a canyon-like feel on Boylston Street. There is a trade-off between creating the canyon-like feel and widening the freeway to full standards in that area. Widening the freeway would displace the first row of homes, approximately fifteen. The project team would like to hear from the participants regarding this issue. The remaining lots could be turned into greenspace.

2. Reduction and Elimination of Weaves. The 6-lane and 8-lane alternatives remove two existing weaves: Ship Canal and northbound Mercer. To eliminate the Ship Canal weave, the tunnel off the left side of I-5 to SR 520 would be removed. A new tunnel would be built which exits from the right side of I-5 and takes traffic underneath I-5. To eliminate the northbound Mercer weave, the northbound on-ramp will be moved from the left to the right side. In addition, both the 6 and 8-lane alternatives remove the southbound Mercer weave. If the 8-lane alternative is chosen, both the Mercer weaves will be removed. If the 6-lane alternative is chosen, it is likely only the southbound Mercer weave will be eliminated.

   The four-lane alternative rebuilds the bridge and adds a HOV connection to help buses get from SR 520 to downtown Seattle.

3. Potential lid location and connectivity opportunities. Artists' drawings of what activities may take place on top of proposed lids are available for viewing.

4. Noise mitigation case study. Draft projections of noise levels with the 6-lane alternative are available.

5. Stormwater treatment options. Stormwater currently goes into the neighborhoods and Lake Washington untreated. There are suggested locations for these treatment facilities.

To address the outstanding issues listed above, the workshop was broken into three stations. Each station contained drawings and maps of the Eastlake, Roanoke Park, Portage Bay, north Capitol Hill areas. Members of the project team were present at each station to provide explanation, answer questions, and to record public comment. The stations were as follows:

- Station 1: Mitigation opportunities
- Station 2: Community connectivity – lids and bicycle/pedestrian.
- Station 3: Local access ramps and streets.

Based on the project status, workshop objectives, and outstanding design issues presented by Les Rubstello and Jeff Peacock, the following questions and issues were raised by participants.

- What will make this project happen? A gas tax? *A statewide ballot in November 2002 will ask voters to implement a nine-cent gas tax in order to pay for transportation projects. If this passes, Trans-Lake would receive about 100 million dollars. This money would allow us to begin the design work. The regional vote may then be enough to fund some portion of construction. Presently, King, Snohomish, and Pierce Counties are meeting to put the measure together. The regional vote may take place in November 2002, but will most likely take place Spring 2003. The transportation projects for this measure have not been specified. Optimistically, we could be building something in 2005, such as pontoons for a bridge.*
- Is Seward School affected by this project? *Seward School is kept intact.*
- Is the off-ramp from SR 520 to I-5 lidded? *The road is not lidded. It is a possibility to have noise walls along the side.*

- Will the four-lane alternative have lids? *No. If the 4-lane alternative is chosen, it will be a low-cost option and the freeway will not be widened. There will be no additional traffic through the neighborhoods; however, noise walls would be added along the facility.*
- How is the placement of noise walls determined? *The highest noise wall anyone has ever built is 20 feet. If a 20-foot noise wall cannot block the sound then a noise wall will not be built. We would put a noise wall closest to the source or closest to the receiver. If a house sits above the road, then the noise wall will be on top of the hill. The tradeoff is losing the view and community input on this tradeoff will be critical.*
- What about widening I-5 as part of WSDOT's 20-year plan? *If the SR 520 off-ramp to I-5 is located on the right side, it can become a two-lane ramp. One lane will drop at Mercer, the other lane drops at Stewart. There will be a new southbound lane from approximately Newton to Stewart. This will most likely happen even with the 6-lane alternative. However, this is the only widening of I-5 that WSDOT is currently considering.*
- What happens to Boylston Street, if the 15 homes are acquired? *It is kept open. The street would continue to function as it does today, and be rebuilt further to the west.*
- You are effectively influencing the results by saying the 8-lane alternative is more beneficial because it reduces noise and gets rid of the weaves. That is not an accurate analysis of the alternatives. What are we talking about having improvements with some alternatives and not with others? If you make comparisons, you have to get rid of enhancements. The results will be biased. *There are four alternatives in the EIS: no-action; 4-lane; 6-lane; and 8-lane. The cost-benefit analysis is separate from the EIS. The elimination of weaves is a separate improvement that can be considered with any of the alternatives. The Executive Committee will decide which alternative is selected.*
- I remember noise walls were supposed to be built prior to this project. *Noise walls were slated to be built in this area, separate from the Tran-Lake Washington Project. This was cut due to I-695.*
- What is presently proposed for dead-ending intersections at Roanoke? *This is no longer being considered. Roanoke will stay the same.*
- Will the fire station or WSDOT building be taken? *No.*
- If SR 520 is expanded, will it be in the existing right-of-way? *Yes, for all alternatives.*
- How does the lid area relate to flyovers? *The lids would be next to the flyover ramps. The lid would be a little lower than the ramp.*

Report Back from Workshop Sessions

Pat Serie reconvened the group after an approximately two-hour session during which community members were able to participate in the three different stations. She asked each workstation to summarize the comments received and provide a list of follow-up items. For a full listing of recorded comments at each workstation, see Appendix A.

STATION 1: MITIGATION OPPORTUNITIES

There was some discussion regarding the impact of widening I-5 on buildings in the Eastlake area. Some participants suggested noise walls along I-5. A few participants were concerned that an amphitheatre effect may be created on the Portage Bay Viaduct and suggested moving the absorptive aluminum walls farther south on 13th Avenue East. One participant suggested using stormwater over the noise walls to create a waterfall.

Michael Minor, Minor & Associates, responded to several inquiries regarding noise walls.

- Does noise off the roadway coming up the hill impact noise emissions, such that the slope should be adjusted to minimize noise*? Probably not as it would not be a significant enough change in noise.*
- If that roadway reached grade one-hundred yards sooner than now, would that change the amount of reflective surface? *It might make it better for some locations, but worse for people on the other side of the hill.*
- Do steeper roads make truck noise better or worse? *It makes noise worse.*

Action Items:

- Return with specific proposals for noise wall locations and impact of noise walls on neighborhoods.

STATION 2: COMMUNITY CONNECTIVITY – LIDS AND BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN

The major theme from this station was to increase connectivity. In general, the lid proposed for SR 520 and 10th Avenue would ideally be located between 10th Avenue and Delmar. Participants would like to see an improved connection between the proposed lid and Roanoke Park, regardless of where the lid is located. Most participants were interested in improving the east-west pedestrian/bicycle connections, specifically the Interlake through Broadway East neighborhood, by creating an underpass under 10th Avenue. Some participants suggested extending the park to the water and improving trail facilities at the west end of Portage Bay. Some participants were concerned that the current placement of the lid may not generate enough use. Other participants felt that the placement would serve the community well as a place of recreation. One participant suggested that schools use the lid during school hours and the general public use the space at other times.

Action Items:

- Show lid between 10th Avenue and Delmar as opposed to I-5 and 10th Avenue.
- Demonstrate improved east-west pedestrian/bicycle connections.
- Improve connection between Roanoke Park and proposed lid.

STATION 3: LOCAL ACCESS RAMPS AND STREETS

In general, participants favored maintaining the existing on- and off-ramps. Most people felt that the accessibility of Eastlake to the freeway makes it an attractive place to live. Removing a ramp could increase traffic in the Montlake/Arboretum neighborhoods and nearby interchanges, and result in a greater travel time for many commuters. Some participants suggested realigning 10th to line up with Harvard, which would help pull traffic from Roanoke Street in front of Roanoke Park. At the same time, participants were concerned that this would increase their commute time. In general participants would rather see the ramp maintained than see 10th realigned. Most participants felt that the current situation at 10th and Harvard makes pedestrian/bicycle movement impossible.

Action Items:

- Demonstrate the closure of Roanoke ramp without causing surface street congestion in Montlake/Arboretum area.

- Investigate the realignment of 10th with Harvard.
- Increase pedestrian/bicycle connections all around.
- Provide transit usage information for ramps.
- Show improved pedestrian connections at Roanoke and Harvard.
- Be prepared to discuss community maintenance strategies for landscaped areas.
- City of Seattle to meet with neighborhood representatives to discuss local streets.
- Be prepared to discuss traffic demand management at the neighborhood level.
- Investigate a tactile crossing at 10th Ave and Roanoke.

The project team responded to the following questions and comments, resulting from the summarization of workstation #3.

- Is it possible that SR 520 access can be maintained by a ramp? *It is possible, but it could only go back to 10th and it would limit movement of traffic on 10th to Harvard.*
- I think the idea of realigning 10th has merit. Dropping it due to cost at this point in the process may be a mistake.
- The realignment of 10th merits further consideration. Its feasibility depends on what happens in Montlake. This is something that the project team should talk to the city about.
- Tradeoffs are not limited to the acquisition of homes on Boylston. There is an issue of whether the quality of life will be reduced with construction and new flyover(s). This warrants further discussion. *The best strategy when writing an EIS is to include the worst-case scenario and the most "takings" of homes. The impacts can then be reduced by further design work without redoing the EIS.*
- Those properties may become difficult to sell, if it is known that they will be acquired by the project in the future. This may cause the owners to allow their homes to deteriorate
- With the realignment of 10th, the neighborhood will be unable to go across Roanoke into Eastlake. If the Roanoke exit off SR 520 is closed, we cannot turn left to go across and Eastlake will lose access. That is the opposite of what most people want, which is more access.
- Regarding the benefits of realigning 10th and Harvard, is it possible to have the Boylston exit peel off the southbound ramp as opposed to having the Roanoke exit peel off the northbound I-5 ramp? This would permit the movement back onto 10th north. *This is possibility. It is worth investigating.*
- What is planned for the existing northbound Mercer ramp that goes to northbound I-5? *The freeway gets moved to the left of where the ramp is today.*

Closing Remarks

Pat Serie adjourned the workshop by saying the project team is committed to return to the community to respond to the issues raised in the roundtable discussions. The summary will be made available on the Trans-Lake Washington Project website, as well as e-mailed to those who have provided their e-mail address.

For written comments, not part of the workshop dialogue, please see Appendix B.

Appendices

Appendix A, Workstation Public Comments

WORKSTATION 1: MITIGATION OPPORTUNITIES

- Address amphitheatre effect from Portage Bay viaduct light-weight absorptive aluminum walls – 6-8'
- Move sampling site further south on 13th E.
- How far away will benefit from noise walls be felt?
- Consider impact of widened I-5 on Eastlake buildings.
- Will noise wall be added to I-5?
- With new flyover on I-5, will there be noise walls along Boylston?
- Pump stormwater through noise walls to create waterfalls over walls with retention ponds below.
- Consider the aesthetics of the wall along Harvard. This will impact the canyon feeling.
- Dirt and dust from the freeway is felt by the floating homes

WORKSTATION 2: COMMUNITY CONNECTIVITY – LIDS AND BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN

Location of Lids

- Why isn't there a lid between 10th and Delmar? Put a lid between 10th and Delmar.
- Move lid towards Delmar. Create a walking bridge as opposed to a lid.
- Supportive of both the current concept and an additional lid between 10th and Delmar .
- Put a bridge from 10th and Delmar. Place a lid across Roanoke to Roanoke Park.
- Is it possible to lid on I-5 between Roanoke and Mercer?
- Extend lid over Boylston.
- Address connectivity to proposed 10th Avenue and lid.
-

Amenities / Enhancements

- Consider the following lid options: sport fields or passive recreation.
- Create a path to playground on north end of Roanoke Park.
- No purpose is served with a lid on Boylston and Roanoke. Take those resources to an area that would benefit (10th and Delmar).
- Add something to attract people/activity to corner of Boyer (commute center, small retail or commercial) active recreation, cultural amenities (art).
- Continue the park at the west end of the Portage Bay viaduct to the water's edge.
- Would plants on Delmar make it impossible to see SR 520? It is difficult to see if it's busy.

Bicycle/Pedestrian

- How wide is the bicycle lane on the SR 520 Bridge? Why on north side?
- Who is talking about impacts to the Arboretum?
- Maintain bicycle/pedestrian connectivity by going under 10th. If under 10th, make sure you connect towards Broadway East and Harvard area (doesn't require lid).

- Explore a crosswalk or pedestrian overpass at Roanoke and Harvard, specifically the north side Roanoke overpass? .
- Will there still be a bus stop on 10th and Roanoke?
- Put a tactile crossing from 10th to Roanoke Park.
- Major bicycle hub: 10th Avenue area.
- Put a pedestrian underpass at 10th regardless of lids.
- Put a bike commute interchange at the Eastlake bike route.
- Improve pedestrian/bicycle access/egress to north end of the Roanoke Bridge.

.

WORKSTATION 3: LOCAL ACCESS RAMPS AND STREETS

Ramps

- Redo Lakeview on-ramp to relieve cut-through traffic.
- Elimination of Roanoke ramp causes the following problems: (1) Forces more traffic thru Montlake (2) Inconvenience for people who live in area.
- Consider Lakeview as a northbound on-ramp, not off-ramp.
- Do not extend flyover ramp into neighborhood.
- Commuters from the Eastside will have to get off at Montlake and take surface streets over with the Roanoke ramp change. This will create congestion in neighborhoods and increase travel time.
- If exit to Roanoke/Harvard is eliminated from SR 520, people are left with limited options (Arboretum and Montlake).
- Especially concerned with increased traffic on Boyer, Delmar Drive, and Arboretum (surface streets) resulting from ramp elimination.
- Supportive of keeping the Boylston southbound on-ramp; the Roanoke northbound on-ramp; and the Lakeview northbound off-ramp.
- Tell us the following: noise configuration, profile, connectivity, and street traffic on Harvard – if the Roanoke exit is eliminated
- Eliminating lanes on Roanoke puts more traffic on surrounding surface streets.
- Opposed to elimination of Roanoke/Harvard exit coming from east on SR 520 – pushes traffic onto surface streets.
- Keep Lakeview ramp for all scenarios.
- Landscape (trees/shrubs) all ramps in the interest of aesthetics and noise.
- Is the existing Roanoke ramp used by buses (dead heading back from eastside)? Request more information on the use of the Roanoke ramp by buses (dead heading back from the eastside).
- Provide more detail regarding the closure of the Eastlake/Harvard off-ramp.

Pedestrian/Bicycle

- Make the Roanoke and Harvard intersection more pedestrian friendly. If lidded, must create pedestrian access. The lid should not only serve to mitigate, but connect.
- Consider widening Roanoke Bridge over I-5 for bicycle/pedestrian
- Coordinate the pedestrian light on Harvard and Edgar or Harvard and Shelby with the Roanoke light.
- Create an overpass at Hamlin; a pedestrian light will not work.

- Ensure that all elements are pedestrian friendly!
- Create a tactile crossing at 10th Ave and Roanoke to connect to bus system on 10th Ave on west side. Many system users have an extremely difficult time crossing from St. Patrick's Church. Could this be a part of the project?

Relocation

- If property changes hands in next 10 years, specifically homes that may be taken for this project, what reason is there to save them?
- Consider the interest of the entire community when looking at taking property.
- Elimination of the 15 houses on Boylston is monstrous – compounds damage. The resulting greenspace, next to freeway wall, will not be appealing.
- Widen Roanoke Viaduct (where crosses Boyer) only to the south. This avoids taking residences or getting too close to residences
- Do not relocate houses removed along Boylston. Open space should remain.

Aesthetics

- Erect long-term noise wall on west side of Boylston and relocate Boylston.
- Widening of freeway brings noise and dirt too close to the corner of Howe and Franklin Pl. NE. There is already a problem with trucks.
- Could the lids space across for Seward School be used by the school or designated for school use?
- Consider community maintenance strategy for landscaped areas.

Streets

- Concerned with the realignment of 10th (and Roanoke) because it splits potential lid into pieces .
- Consider a right turn from Harvard to Roanoke southbound. Build a new lane or re-stripe.
- Do not change the easy commute time from eastside to Eastlake and Capitol Hill (Roanoke Park).
- Include queues for HOV lane going south, connecting to SR 520.
- Do not dead-end Broadway, 10th and 11th at Roanoke.

Other

-
- Post perspectives on website.
- Eastlake interests request to sit down with the City of Seattle to discuss streets in conjunction with Trans-Lake WA Project.
- People going to the University of Washington already get there by transit.
- Would like to see transportation demand management discussed at the neighborhood level. It should also be part of design discussions.

Appendix B, Written Comments

Comment Form Format:

Mitigation Measures – Noise

1. *How does the existing noise information translate into mitigation opportunities for you?*
2. *Do you have reactions or suggested changes to the proposed noise wall locations?*

Community Connectivity – Lids and Bicycle/Pedestrian

1. *Do the proposed lid locations provide the most community connectivity and why?*
2. *What pedestrian/bicycle connections should be included as part of the project?*

Local Access Ramps and Streets

1. *Should existing on and off-ramps at Boylston, Harvard, and Lakeview be maintained or eliminated? What trade-offs between maintaining existing on and off ramps versus eliminating them may be acceptable to the community?*
2. *If existing on and off-ramps and Boylston, Harvard, and Lakeview are maintained, what improvements to neighborhood streets should be made?*
3. *If existing on and off-ramps at Boylston, Harvard, and Lakeview are eliminated, what improvements to neighborhood streets should be made*

Comment #1

Community Connectivity – Lids and Bicycle/Pedestrian

1. I appreciate the thought and effort to construct a lid over the interchange between I-5 and 520. It appears to me as though this will be the key element to win over the communities support for this project – nothing Seattleites love more than a little more green…instead of gray

Local Access Ramps and Streets

1. The existing on/off ramps at Boylston, Harvard and Lakeview should be maintained. These are vital to the community as easy ways of reducing congestion on Eastlake – if these exits were eliminated we would end up potentially turning Eastlake Ave. into 99 and I would prefer not to have that in my backyard!
2. I think the lid would be beneficial to the surrounding community and should off set potential negatives to keeping the on/off ramps
3. Please do not eliminate these exits

Other Comments:

Thank you for hosting this meeting.

Comment #2

Mitigation Measures – Noise

1. It shows that there are noise levels at present are unacceptable. We want the attached sound barrier system installed on the existing 520 viaduct that will remain used and add this system to the new bridge.
2. The Fuhrman-Boyer Neighborhood Improvement Association is concerned that the viaduct noise wall area is being overlooked.

Community Connectivity – Lids and Bicycle/Pedestrian

1. We want a lid all the way to 11th.
2. Making Fuhrman-Boyer into a bicycle friendly by-way by enhancing traffic calming.

Local Access Ramps and Streets

1. Yes – all must be maintained. No eliminations of any. It forces more traffic through the neighborhoods. In fact Lakeview should be made as an entrance onto Southbound.
2. N/A
3. Traffic calming on every intersection due to traffic being forced through the neighborhoods.

Other Comments:
West end of viaduct – all land underneath be developed into community park and access to water with a floating walkway/like Foster Island to Montlake Park.

Comment #3
Mitigation Measures – Noise

1. Noise mitigation is needed on I-5 as it parallels Harvard from Roanoke north to at least Franklin/Allison or Eastlake. The current design has Express lanes reflecting noise off of the bottom of the GP deck causing intolerable noise levels west of Harvard.
2. Extend noise mitigation North on I-5 express lanes from Roanoke to Eastlake/Harvard intersection. New lanes across Portage Bay need noise mitigation.

Community Connectivity – Lids and Bicycle/Pedestrian

1. Fill the lid hole between 10th and Delmar. Explore a landscaped median on Boylston in front of Seward School.
2. Separate bicycle/pedestrian path all the way from Arboretum to Medina. Traffic calming all along Boyer/Fuhrman to accommodate safe bicycle route from Arboretum/Montlake to University Bridge. Boyer/Fuhrman is a heavily used bike and pedestrian corridor but is extremely dangerous due to speeding and cut thru traffic Consult with FARNIA on this.

Local Access Ramps and Streets

1. Keep the ramps. Try to add a north to right (west) turn lane on Harvard at Roanoke.
2. Traffic calming devices needed at every intersection along Fuhrman and Boyer. These streets receive cut thru traffic due to Montlake area being our capacity.
3. Traffic calming on Fuhrman and Boyer from Eastlake/U Bridge to 23rd.

Other Comments:
Landscape/park under 520 airspace from beginning of bridge to water and connect to Montlake playground and connect to Dawson Trail.

Comment #4
Community Connectivity – Lids and Bicycle/Pedestrian

1. On lids = no retail on lids = this is already a congested corridor and there is no area for parking. Lids/green belts should by and large not be below flyovers. Eliminate flyovers whenever possible. Flyovers increase noise and a lid/green belt before flyovers doesn't provide benefits to the community.

Local Access Ramps and Streets

2. Need more information about possible realignment of 10th proposed by consultants to determine possible impact on community. Traffic may be improved but am concerned about visual impact and possible increased noise if elevated or flyover proposed. This does merit further consideration.

Comment #5

Mitigation Measures – Noise

1. Real need to cut noise coming off 520 viaduct need to cut noise on I-5 north of Roanoke lid 10th Ave E and 11th.
2. I am told they are planned everywhere! That is great!

Community Connectivity – Lids and Bicycle/Pedestrian

1. Lid at 10th and Roanoke has access. Problem as does lid in from of Seward School/I-5. Pull lid over 520 further east.
2. Need speedy crossing both North and south on 10th and e/w on Harvard at Roanoke.

Local Access Ramps and Streets

1. Lakeview definitely maintain off I-5. Harvard definitely maintain on I-5. Boylston definitely maintain exit I-5.
2. Issue of Tenth and Roanoke needs resolution option shown of re-alignment of Tenth with Harvard is of interest. Need to coordinate clean up of exit problems 520 west at Montlake.
3. Really bad option! These are really important! Can't mitigate their removal.

Other Comments:

Need to know how construction noise will be mitigated.

Comment #6

Community Connectivity – Lids and Bicycle/Pedestrian

1. Shifting the lid that spans 10th E to the East (filling gap with Delmar) gives many improved opportunities to improve connectivity ideally with a path/bikeway that connects both to the eastern portion of the lid (toward Seward School) and back to dead-end at Broadway East – if path would pass under 10th it would separate traffic. This connection links interlake all the way downtown.

Local Access Ramps and Streets

1. Maintained
2. Comment on eliminating the westbound exit to Roanoke/Harvard – need to carefully assess the traffic impact on Montlake exit and streets connecting to Delmar. This impact probably will be a significant problem, both by increasing Montlake traffic and adding travel time to neighborhood people who use the ramp. It is worth more study on realignment possibility if the ramp can be kept somehow (into Roanoke south of park? Tied into realignment.)

Comment #7

Mitigation Measures – Noise

1. The largest amount of noise is generated off both the Ship Canal Bridge and the Portage Bay viaduct noise walls aren't very effective at reducing that noise which really travels across the lake. There needs to be effective mitigation on the bridge. A noise wall would benefit me some because I live close to the right of way but no effective proposal.
2. Was presented that will reduce noise.

Community Connectivity – Lids and Bicycle/Pedestrian

1. No – the lids are too small and in the wrong place. The lids should extend from tops at Boylston across I-5 and then along the Sr%20 highway from I-5 to Delmar Drive. Passive recreation and or athletic fields (without lighting would be good). Large lid currently

proposed behind fire station should go from current location of 10th to Delmar Drive where it does the most good for the neighborhood.
2. Pedestrian/bicycle connections – connect Interlake Park with Roanoke Park (combine Stormwater/Waterfalls in connection with noise walls and lids to diffuse noise.

Local Access Ramps and Streets

1. Lakeview yes – maintain the off ramp, ideally Lakeview would have both on and off ramp. Ok to close off ramp at Harvard if expanded lid/noise wall along 520 from Harvard to Delmar. Boylston on ramp is poorly designed because traffic is trying to move right to exit at Mercer.
2. Ok to eliminate off ramp at Boylston heading south.
3. Improve/expand lid from I-5 along Roanoke to Delmar/11th.

Comment #8

Mitigation Measures – Noise

1. Not clear – all answers were provisional. "It might decrease your noise – or stay same, we can't really tell.

Community Connectivity – Lids and Bicycle/Pedestrian

1. Location would be good if it provided a continuous trail between Montlake playfield, Interlaken Park and the Roanoke lid. Needs to be easily approachable by foot, bike, car.

Local Access Ramps and Streets

1. Whatever plan, all access routes must be mitigated by green and sound abatement.

Other Comments:

Boyer triangle "park" could be developed as recreation center, art studios, sm. offices. It's dreadful as a park because of the forbidding scale of the freeway above.

Electronic Comment Submission

I have provided some thoughts on the Portage Bay area below.

As I mentioned on the phone, the neighborhood along Boyer Avenue between Highway 520 and 15th Ave/Mountlake Park seems to be left off of many of the maps and studies I have seen for the Trans Lake project.

This is an area of single family homes, condominiums, and apartments clustered around the southern end of Portage Bay, south of the 520 viaduct. The neighborhood contains over 120 homes and a community park within about 500 feet of the viaduct. This neighborhood has the closest visual proximity to the project because most residences look over the bay and at the viaduct.

The underwater portion of Mountlake Park includes most of Portage Bay between the shoreline and the Highway 520 viaduct. The area is used extensively by rowers, fishermen and kyakers. The bay and shoreline support a variety and abundance of wildlife. We regularly observe eagles, beaver, muskrat, kingfisher, herons, numerous types of ducks, salmon, and turtles.

I just checked noise levels at about 7:30pm using a handheld meter with a C weighted scale. Noise levels at Boyer Ave are about 65 dba and about 75 dba at the water. These levels may exceed the current FHWA standards for the residential and park uses in the area.

The Portage Bay viaduct is a key segment of the Trans Lake project because of its visibility, proximity to many residences, and high level of active and passive recreation use

adjacent to and under the proposal. I hope that noise, visual, water quality and wildlife impacts of the proposed expansion of the Highway 520 viaduct receive attention and mitigating measures which are commensurate with the high level of recreation, residential, and wildlife use of the area.

Please let me know how I can participate in the highway planning process.

Appendix C, Workshop Participants and Project Team

Name	Affiliation
Participants	
Ahlers, Melissa	Eastlake
Carter, Katy	Councilmember Heidi Wills Office
Conley, Gerry	
Dubman, Jonathan	Montlake Community Club
Gown, Carol	Resident
Gunby, George	1000 Friends of Washington
Gunby, Virginia	1000 Friends of Washington
Iles, Catherine	Roanoke Council
Jones, Allan	North Capitol Hill Neighborhood Assoc.
Joneson, Kingsley	Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council
Kedelsky, Spider	
Lampe, Matt	North Capitol Hill Neighborhood Association
Lane, Ted	N.O.I.S.E.
McKinley, Kirk	Fuhrman & Boyer Neighborhood Improvement Associations/Pedestrian Advocate
Melnikoff, Ron	
Mundy, Bill	Canterbury Shores Condo, SR 520
Nyberg, Clara	
Oaksen, Greg	
Owens, Thomas	Portage Bay/Roanoke
Peck, Cornelius	No Expansion of 520
Pederson, Mary Lou	Eastlake Community Council Board
Preston, Anne	
Reckers, Jim	Eastlake Community Council
Rudolph, Robert	Medina City Council
Seinfeld, Keith	
Shean, Pegeen	
Silverberg, Steve	Roanoke Park Council
Simpkins, Jim	Portage Bay/Roanoke Park
Stixrood, Carl	Fuhrman & Boyer Neighborhood Improvement Associations
Stokke, Diane	Roanoke Park/Portage Bay Community Council
Thorne, David	
Wayne, Kath	
Zegree, Joan	

Project Team	
Chipps, Eric	City of Seattle Transportation
Goldenberg, Joy	EnviroIssues
Grotefendt, Amy	EnviroIssues
Hilderbrant, Dave	Parametrix
Hoff, Brad	EnviroIssues
Horntvedt, Michael	Parametrix
Lohse-Clark, Kristen	Parametrix
Minor, Michael	Minor & Associates
Parker, Lorie	CH2M Hill
Phillips, Brad	Parametrix
Renner, Natalie	EnviroIssues
Rubstello, Les	WSDOT
Sanchez, Susan	City of Seattle
Schoneman, Noel	City of Seattle Transportation
Serie, Pat	EnviroIssues
Swift, Lauren	Sound Transit
Wilcox, Kirk	Parametrix